

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,745	10/23/2001	Daniel E. Boss	403391	9390
7590 12/05/2003			EXAMINER	
Harold V. Stotland			CHANG, YEAN HSI	
Seyfarth Shaw	. •			
Suite 4200		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
55 East Monroe Street			2835	
Chicago, IL 60	0603-5803		DATE MAILED: 12/05/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u>. </u>					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/014,745	BOSS ET AL.			
· ·	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Yean-Hsi Chang	2835			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 10 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to available final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper reply to a			
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension			
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	f extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply on the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action: or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>2-23</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approximately approximatel	oved or b)□ disapproved by th	ne Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen					
0. ☐ Other:					
DAPREN SCHUBERG					
	SUPERVISORY P	ATENT EXAMINER CENTER 2800			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The declaration of Mr. Richard K. Williams, one of the inventors of this application, has shown a great result of a measurement of the sound power emanating from different arrangements of a disk drive, and a good reason for installing a disk drive with the PCB facing the bracket. However, figs. 5 and 8 of reference Pottebaum show the same arrangement.